

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-25, 28-40, 42-55, 58, 59, 61 and 62 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 11, 14, 18, 22, 39, 53 and 59 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-12 of the Reply. Claims 2, 5-7, 15-17, 21, 24-25, 40, 43, 49, 52, 54-55, 58 and 61-62 have been canceled.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the teleconference of August 21, 2006 wherein the substance of the interview is as follows: Applicants' representative and Examiner Jarrett discussed in general terms the inventive concept of the instant application as well as generally reviewed the specification. No patentable subject matter was discussed and/or agreed to. Examiner Jarrett indicated that he would be available to review any proposed amendments prior to the submission of the response. Applicants' representative submitted proposed amendments for review prior to the filing of this response.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 53-55, 58, 59, 61 and 62 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 53-55, 58, 59, 61 and 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 53-55, 58, 59, 61 and 62 have been amended to overcome deficiencies related to this rejection, as such the rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5-25, 28-40, 42-55, 58, 59, 61 and 62 Under 35 U.S.C §112

Claims 1, 2, 5-25, 28-40, 42-55, 58, 59, 61 and 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 2, 5-25, 28-40, 42-55, 58, 59, 61 and 62 have been amended as specified by the Examiner. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-19 and 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-19 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ott, Marcus, Conceptual Design and Implementation of a Graphical Workflow-Modeling

Editing in the Context of Distributed Groupware-Databases (1994). It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Ott does not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The claimed invention relates to a graphical user interface (GUI) scheduler program for modeling business workflow processes. In particular, independent claim 1 recites a computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for utilizing a workflow scheduler graphical user interface program, comprising, *...a first screen area; ... a second screen area; a workflow component menu including a plurality of workflow components employed to create a business workflow process in the first screen area,...; a separator bar separating the first screen area from the second screen area,...; at least one implementation port that couples at least one workflow component to the at least one technological component, the at least one implementation port is created on the separator bar by dragging the at least one technological component into the second screen area using a user selection device; at least one role port that connects an action with an associated role to an implementation port on the separator bar,...; a data flow screen that illustrates data flow between the at least one implementation port and the at least one technological component; and an editable transaction property screen employed to relate catch code and compensation code to the transaction component,...; and wherein the graphical representation of the business workflow process is converted into XML code.* Ott does not expressly or inherently disclose the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' invention as recited in the subject claims.

Ott discloses a workflow-modeling editor in the context of distributed groupware-databases. An enterprise model that enables business processes to be modeled and their quality improved has been developed. The editor was developed as an easy-to-use GUI and integrated with the groupware platform Lotus Notes. (See Introduction, pp. 1-4).

In contrast, applicants' claimed invention discloses a GUI schedule interface which allows a user to create a schedule on a first side of the GUI and to define bindings on the other side of the GUI. During creation of the schedule, the workflow component menu will prohibit the user from creating a schedule that will deadlock the schedule by checking the correctness of the schedule flow. Furthermore, the system comprises two types of ports, role ports on roles and implementation ports on the separator bar. Role ports can be created by either connecting an action within an associated role to another action within a different associated role or connecting an action contained within a role to a port on the separator bar. Implementation ports can be created in three ways, first by creating a new port on the separator bar, by deleting a role that contains role ports or by the binding wizards. Role ports can't be edited. Implementation ports can be edited to enable: changing the port name, enable the user to add port messages to the port, new and existing, to remove port messages, to visually reorder the port messages, to edit port messages or to enable port security. Unidirectional port actions can only send message to ports bound to Workflows. All future connections to that port from actions will default to send. If an existing port was specified in the binding wizard, all current connections will be changed to send (if they are not already). The binding wizard will warn the user that these changes will be made. (See pg. 23, line 31-pg. 24, line 13). Ott does not expressly or inherently disclose a system that utilizes *at least one implementation port that couples at least one workflow component to the at least one technological component, the at least one implementation port is created on the separator bar by dragging the at least one technological component into the second screen area using a user selection device; and at least one role port that connects an action with an associated role to an implementation port on the separator bar.* Ott simply provides a graphical workflow model that is integrated with Lotus Notes to enable office workers to design and browse through modeled office procedures.

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that Ott fails to expressly or inherently disclose applicants' claimed invention as recited in independent claim 1 (and claims 2-5, 8-19 and 21 which respectively depend there from). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be deemed allowable.

IV. Rejection of Claims 22-31, 33-35 and 38 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 22-31, 33-35 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated

by Okita *et al.* (US Patent 6,225,998). It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Okita *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims. As stated *supra*, the claimed invention relates to a GUI scheduler program for modeling business workflow processes. In particular, independent claim 22 recites a computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for employing a business process scheduling program, comprising, *a plurality of schedule tool components employed to create a representation of a business process schedule according to a set of predefined rules; an input screen for inputting interfaces and methods of the plurality of schedule tool components; a separator bar for separating the input screen into a first screen area and a second screen area, ...; at least one implementation port that couples at least one workflow component to the schedule tool component, the at least one implementation port is created on the separator bar by dragging the schedule tool component into the second screen area using a user selection device; at least one role port that connects an action with an associated role to an implementation port on the separator bar, ...; a data flow screen that illustrates data flow between the business process schedule and the plurality of schedule tool components; a conversion component employed to convert the schedule to XML code; ...; and an editable transaction property screen employed to relate catch code and compensation code to the transaction component,* Okita *et al.* does not expressly or inherently disclose the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' invention as recited in the subject claims.

Okita *et al.* discloses a system and method for displaying visual primitives of a transaction flow used by a transaction processing system. A visual representation of a transaction flow containing visual primitives is accessed from a storage device contained in a digital computer. The digital computer is then used to display the visual primitives of the transaction flow on a visual display in a manner that provides for unrestricted placement of visual primitives. (See col. 2, lines 1-16).

In contrast, applicants' claimed invention discloses a GUI scheduler program that includes tools to allow a user to create a schedule for business workflow processes based on a set of rules defined by the GUI scheduler program. The rules ensure that deadlock cannot occur within the schedule. The scheduler program allows a user to define actions and group actions into transactions using simple GUI scheduling tools. The schedule can then be converted to executable code in a variety of forms. The GUI scheduling software program includes a business

workflow process area (first screen area) and a binding process area (second screen area). The business workflow process area includes a business workflow process created using a plurality of business workflow graphical interface components. The binding process area includes a binding process created using a plurality of binding graphical interface components. The components in the business workflow process are coupled to the components in the binding process by a plurality of communication ports. A data flow connection screen is provided that illustrates the data flow connections associated with variables of binding components and the communications ports allowing a user to view the message flows of the business process. (See pg. 8, lines 23-31).

Furthermore, the system also comprises two types of ports, role ports on roles and implementation ports on the separator bar. Role ports can be created by either connecting an action within an associated role to another action within a different associated role or connecting an action contained within a role to a port on the separator bar. Implementation ports can be created in three ways, first by creating a new port on the separator bar, by deleting a role that contains role ports or by the binding wizards. Role ports can't be edited. Implementation ports can be edited to enable: changing the port name, enable the user to add port messages to the port, new and existing, to remove port messages, to visually reorder the port messages, to edit port messages or to enable port security. (See pg. 23, line 31-pg. 24, line 13). Okita *et al.* does not expressly or inherently disclose a system that utilizes, *at least one implementation port that couples at least one workflow component to the schedule tool component, the at least one implementation port is created on the separator bar by dragging the schedule tool component into the second screen area using a user selection device; and at least one role port that connects an action with an associated role to an implementation port on the separator bar.* Okita *et al.* simply provides a system for displaying visual primitives used by a transactional processing system.

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that Okita *et al.* fails to expressly or inherently disclose applicants' claimed invention as recited in independent claim 22 (and claims 23-31, 33-35 and 38 which respectively depend there from). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be deemed allowable.

V. Rejection of Claims 53-55 and 58 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 53-55 and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by

Action Technologies ActionWorkflow system and method (product) as evidenced at least by ActionWorkflow Enterprise Series 3.0 Process Builder User's Guide (1996). It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Action Technologies does not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims. As stated *supra*, the claimed invention relates to a GUI scheduler program for modeling business workflow processes. In particular, independent claim 53 recites a system that facilitates modeling of business processes that are representable at a transaction level and an action level, the system, comprising, *a graphical user interface; a plurality of modeling components accessible through the graphical user interface and employed to create a graphical representation of a business process and a binding of the business process to at least one technological component; at least a portion of the plurality of modeling components residing on a workflow component menu employed to create the graphical representation of a business workflow process in a first screen area; at least a portion of the plurality of modeling components residing on a binding component menu employed to create a binding to the graphical representation of the business workflow process in a second screen area; a separator bar separating the first screen area from the second screen area,...; at least one implementation port coupling at least one component of the graphical representation of the business process to the technological component,...; at least one role port that connects an action with an associated role to an implementation port on the separator bar,...; a data flow screen illustrating data flow between the implementation port and the technological component; and wherein the graphical representation of the business workflow process is converted into XML code*. Action Technologies does not expressly or inherently disclose the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' invention as recited in the subject claims.

Action Technologies discloses a method for installing the Action Workflow Process Builder. The User Guide shows you how to utilize the process builder window to create a business-process map. Specifically, business-process definitions are used to create a map that is a graphical representation of the business process. Workflows are based on templates that control the acts and states available to workflow participants. The two main types of templates are Request and Offer and all templates are based on one type or the other. (See pp. 2-1 – 2-3 and 3-6 – 3-12).

In contrast, applicants' claimed invention discloses a GUI schedule interface, which

allows the user to create a schedule on a first side of the GUI and to define bindings on the other side of the GUI. During creation of the schedule, the scheduler program will prohibit the user from creating a schedule that will deadlock the schedule by checking the correctness of the schedule flow. A data flow screen is provided based on the schedule messages and the binding component interfaces and methods. The data flow of messages is then defined by simply connecting the message ports to binding component interfaces to ensure proper data flow between entities.

Furthermore, the system comprises two types of ports, role ports on roles and implementation ports on the separator bar. Role ports can be created by either connecting an action within an associated role to another action within a different associated role or connecting an action contained within a role to a port on the separator bar. Implementation ports can be created in three ways, first by creating a new port on the separator bar, by deleting a role that contains role ports or by the binding wizards. Role ports can't be edited. Implementation ports can be edited to enable: changing the port name, enable the user to add port messages to the port, new and existing, to remove port messages, to visually reorder the port messages, to edit port messages or to enable port security. (See pg. 23, line 31-pg. 24, line 13).

Action Technologies does not expressly or inherently disclose a system that utilizes *at least one implementation port coupling at least one component of the graphical representation of the business process to the technological component, ...; and at least one role port that connects an action with an associated role to an implementation port on the separator bar*. Action Technologies simply provide for the installation of a Workflow Process Builder, wherein workflows are based on templates that control the acts and states available to workflow participants.

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that Action Technologies fails to expressly or inherently disclose applicants' claimed invention as recited in independent claim 53 (and claims 54-58 which respectively depend there from). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be deemed allowable.

VI. Rejection of Claims 59, 61 and 62 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 59, 61 and 62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ott, Marcus, Conceptual Design and Implementation of a Graphical Workflow-Modeling Editing in

the Context of Distributed Groupware-Databases (1994). It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Ott does not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims. As stated *supra*, the claimed invention relates to a GUI scheduler program for modeling business workflow processes. In particular, independent claim 59 recites a computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions, comprising, *means for allowing a user to create a graphical representation of a business process; means for providing an input screen for inputting interfaces and methods of at least one technological component; means for displaying a separator bar for separating the input screen into a first screen area and a second screen area, ...; means for allowing a user to create a binding of the graphical representation of the business process to at least one technological component; means for allowing a user to create a workflow component menu...; means for retrieving and displaying an implementation port image employed to bind a technological component to a component in a business workflow process in response to a user selecting one of the technological components and dragging the component into the second screen area using a user selection device; means for retrieving and displaying at least one role port that connects an action with an associated role to an implementation port on the separator bar, ...; means for viewing data flow between the means for coupling and the at least one technological component; and means for displaying an editable transaction property screen employed to relate catch code and compensation code to the transaction component, ...; and wherein the representation of the business workflow process is converted into XML code.* Ott does not expressly or inherently disclose the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' invention as recited in the subject claims.

Ott discloses a workflow-modeling editor in the context of distributed groupware-databases. An enterprise model that enables business processes to be modeled and their quality improved has been developed. The editor was developed as an easy-to-use GUI and integrated with the groupware platform Lotus Notes. (See Introduction, pp. 1-4).

As stated *supra*, applicants' claimed invention discloses a GUI schedule interface which allows a user to create a schedule on a first side of the GUI and to define bindings on the other side of the GUI. During creation of the schedule, the workflow component menu will prohibit the user from creating a schedule that will deadlock the schedule by checking the correctness of the schedule flow. Furthermore, the system comprises two types of ports, role ports on roles and

implementation ports on the separator bar. Role ports can be created by either connecting an action within an associated role to another action within a different associated role or connecting an action contained within a role to a port on the separator bar. Implementation ports can be created in three ways, first by creating a new port on the separator bar, by deleting a role that contains role ports or by the binding wizards. (See pg. 23, line 31-pg. 24, line 13).

Ott does not expressly or inherently disclose a system that utilizes *means for retrieving and displaying an implementation port image employed to bind a technological component to a component in a business workflow process in response to a user selecting one of the technological components and dragging the component into the second screen area using a user selection device; and means for retrieving and displaying at least one role port that connects an action with an associated role to an implementation port on the separator bar*. Ott simply provides a graphical workflow model that is integrated with Lotus Notes to enable office workers to design and browse through modeled office procedures.

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that Ott fails to expressly or inherently disclose applicants' claimed invention as recited in independent claim 59 (and claims 60-62 which respectively depend there from). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be deemed allowable.

VII. Rejection of Claims 39-47 and 49 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

Claims 39-47 and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by TeamWARE Group's Teamware Flow as evidenced by at least the following: Teamware Flow 3.1 User's Guide (2000). It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Teamware Flow does not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims. As stated *supra*, the claimed invention relates to a graphical user interface (GUI) scheduler program for modeling business workflow processes. In particular, independent claim 39 recites a computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions, comprising, *code for providing a first screen region that is employed by a user to create a representation of a business workflow process and providing a second screen region that is employed by a user to bind the business process workflow representation to a representation of at least one technological component; and displaying a separator bar between the first screen area and the second screen area, ...; displaying a workflow component menu*

having a plurality of workflow components employed to create a business workflow process in the first screen region, ...; retrieving and displaying an implementation port image employed to bind a technological component to a component in a business workflow process in response to a user selecting one of the plurality of technological components and dragging the component into the second screen area using a user selection device; retrieving and displaying at least one role port that connects an action with an associated role to an implementation port on the separator bar, ...; displaying a data flow screen that illustrates data flow between the at least one implementation port and the at least one technological component; and displaying an editable transaction property screen employed to relate catch code and compensation code to the transaction component, ...; and wherein the representation of the business workflow process is converted into XML code. Teamware Flow does not expressly or inherently disclose the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' invention as recited in the subject claims.

Teamware Flow discloses a workflow automation tool that helps individuals coordinate their activities to carry-out a business process. The User Guide describes how to use standard features of TeamWARE Flow: the Viewer, Planner and FormBuilder modules and the Mail Integration and Web Integration features. The TeamWARE Flow Planner describes how to use the Viewer to start and participate in processes and how to modify process plans. The Planner can be used to graphically define process plans and for a change in the current activity of the process. (See Introduction, pp. 8-10).

As stated *supra*, applicants' GUI scheduling software program includes a business workflow process area (first screen area) and a binding process area (second screen area). The business workflow process area includes a business workflow process created using a plurality of business workflow graphical interface components. The binding process area includes a binding process created using a plurality of binding graphical interface components. The components in the business workflow process are coupled to the components in the binding process by a plurality of communication ports. A data flow connection screen is provided that illustrates the data flow connections associated with variables of binding components and the communications ports allowing a user to view the message flows of the business process. (See pg. 8, lines 23-31).

Furthermore, the system also comprises two types of ports, role ports on roles and implementation ports on the separator bar. Role ports can be created by either connecting an action within an associated role to another action within a different associated role or connecting

an action contained within a role to a port on the separator bar. Implementation ports can be created in three ways, first by creating a new port on the separator bar, by deleting a role that contains role ports or by the binding wizards. Role ports can't be edited. Implementation ports can be edited to enable: changing the port name, enable the user to add port messages to the port, new and existing, to remove port messages, to visually reorder the port messages, to edit port messages or to enable port security. (See pg. 23, line 31-pg. 24, line 13).

Teamware Flow does not expressly or inherently disclose a system that utilizes *retrieving and displaying an implementation port image employed to bind a technological component to a component in a business workflow process in response to a user selecting one of the plurality of technological components and dragging the component into the second screen area using a user selection device; and retrieving and displaying at least one role port that connects an action with an associated role to an implementation port on the separator bar.* Teamware Flow simply provides a workflow automation tool that allows users to participate in processes and modify process plans.

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that Teamware Flow fails to expressly or inherently disclose applicants' claimed invention as recited in independent claim 39 (and claims 40-47 and 49 which respectively depend there from). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be deemed allowable.

VIII. Rejection of Claims 6 and 7 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ott, Marcus, Conceptual Design and Implementation of a Graphical Workflow-Modeling Editing in the Context of Distributed Groupware-Databases (1994) as applied to claim 1 above. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Ott does not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims. As stated *supra*, Ott does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies with respect to independent claim 1 (which claims 6-7 depend there from). Thus, the subject invention as recited in claims 6-7 is not obvious over Ott. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn.

IX. Rejection of Claim 20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ott, Marcus, Conceptual Design and Implementation of a Graphical Workflow-Modeling Editing in the Context of Distributed Groupware-Databases (1994) as applied to claims 1-19 and 21 above, and further in view of Visio as evidenced by at least the following:

- I. Doherty, Paul, Visio Reshaping Company Thinking (1999), hereinafter reference A; and
- II. Lennox, Michael, Draw smart with Visio 2000 Technical Edition (1999), hereinafter reference B.

It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Ott and Visio, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Visio does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Ott with respect to independent claim 1 (which claim 20 depends there from). Thus, the subject invention as recited in claim 20 is not obvious over Ott and Visio. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn.

X. Rejection of Claims 32, 36 and 37 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 32, 36 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okita *et al.* (US Patent 6,225,998) as applied to claims 31, 22 and 35 above. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Okita *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims. As stated *supra*, Okita *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies with respect to independent claim 22 (which claims 32 and 36-37 depend there from). Thus, the subject invention as recited in claims 32 and 36-37 is not obvious over Okita *et al.* Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn.

XI. Rejection of Claim 48 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 48 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over TeamWARE Group's Teamware Flow as evidenced by at least Teamware Flow 3.1 User's Guide (2000) as applied to claims 39-47 above, and further in view of Visio as evidenced by at least the following:

I. Doherty, Paul, Visio Reshaping Company Thinking (1999), hereinafter reference A; and

II. Lennox, Michael, Draw smart with Visio 2000 Technical Edition (1999), hereinafter reference B.

It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Teamware Flow and Visio, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Visio does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Teamware Flow with respect to independent claim 39 (which claim 48 depends there from). Thus, the subject invention as recited in claim 48 is not obvious over the combination of Teamware Flow and Visio. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn.

XII. Rejection of Claims 50-52 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 50-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over TeamWARE Group's Teamware Flow as evidenced by at least Teamware Flow 3.1 User's Guide (2000) as applied to claims 39 and 46, and further in view of Ott, Marcus, Conceptual Design and Implementation of a Graphical Workflow-Modeling Editing in the Context of Distributed Groupware-Databases (1994). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for the following reasons. Teamware Flow and Ott, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Ott does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Teamware Flow with respect to independent claim 39 (which claims 50-52 depend there from). Thus, the subject invention as recited in claims 50-52 is not obvious over the combination of Teamware Flow and Ott. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP115US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Marisa J. Zink/

Marisa J. Zink

Reg. No. 48,064

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731